



Facilities Efficiency Standards

FES and District Practices Capacity Report

County: BERGEN

District: Rutherford Boro
Pre-Kindergarten Type: Full Day

District Code: 4600

District Type:
Kindergarten Type: Full Day

LRFP: 2017 LRFP Update

NOTE: The FES Analysis is based on the FES version referenced in the 2002 Bi-Annual Report.

School Code	Existing School Name	Proposed School Name	Proposed Grades	Proposed School Enrollment	Existing Capacity				Proposed Capacity			
					FES Capacity		District Practices Capacity		FES Capacity		District Practices Capacity	
					Existing FES Capacity	Existing District Practices Capacity	Existing FES Capacity	Existing District Practices Capacity	Proposed FES Capacity	Proposed District Practices Capacity	Proposed FES Capacity	Proposed District Practices Capacity
090	Kindergarten Center	Kindergarten Center	K	186	123.17	-62.83	123.17	-62.83	123.17	-62.83	123.17	-62.83
070	Lincoln K-3 Elementary	Lincoln K-3 Elementary	1, 2, 3, PK4	343	279.29	-63.71	322.90	-20.10	317.09	-25.91	360.70	17.70
080	Pierrepont 4-6 Elementary / Middle School	Pierrepont 4-6 Elementary / Middle School	4, 5, 6, SCSEK5	671	452.41	-218.59	593.78	-77.22	560.78	-110.22	710.78	39.78
050	Rutherford High School 9-12	Rutherford High School 9-12	9, 10, 11, 12, SCSE912	766	437.80	-328.20	746.30	-19.70	437.80	-328.20	831.30	65.30
100	Union 7-8 Middle School	Union 7-8 Middle School	7, 8, SCSE68	401	376.23	-24.77	516.60	115.60	376.23	-24.77	516.60	115.60
110	Washington K-3 Elementary	Washington K-3 Elementary	1, 2, 3, PK4	344	270.49	-73.51	347.80	3.80	270.49	-73.51	347.80	3.80
District Totals				2,711	1,939.39	-771.61	2,700.18	-10.82	2,085.56	-625.44	2,939.98	228.98
Grade Totals:				Overassigned Students	Unassigned Students							
PK				0	0	62	59.35	-2.65	0.00	-62.00	59.35	-2.65
Grades K-5				0	0	1,257	931.37	-325.63	1,279.06	22.06	1,066.74	-190.26
Grades 6-8				0	0	626	510.86	-115.14	674.82	48.82	521.66	-104.34
Grades 9-12				0	0	766	437.80	-328.20	746.30	-19.70	437.80	-328.20
											831.30	65.30

"Overassigned" represents the number of students, based on the Proposed School Enrollments, that exceed the Proposed District-wide Enrollments.

"Unassigned" represents the number of students, based on the Proposed District-wide Enrollments, that are not assigned to a school.

Negative numbers indicate inadequate capacity; Positive numbers indicate surplus capacity.



Rutherford Schools: Long Range Facilities Plan Report

January 16, 2018 (Early Executive Summary release for Committee review)

Introduction

District Intent:

The Rutherford Board of Education intends to upgrade their facilities District-wide through a Referendum Project. This Referendum will include capital improvements throughout the District including, but not limited to, Core Facility Additions, Classroom Additions, Site Modifications, Interior Renovations, and Infrastructure Improvements to various Building Attributes and Mechanical Systems at the schools. These improvements would allow the District to accommodate anticipated student population trends, to function more efficiently, and to help create a productive environment for learning that benefits the students of the District.

Principals

*Marc R. Parette, AIA, PP
Gregory J. Somjen, AIA

Partners

*John Carlton, AIA
Stephen D. Quick, AIA

Associates

*William Bannister, AIA
Melissa Insinga, NCIDQ
Edward Neighbour, AIA
*Erin Vasold, AIA

*LEED AP

Since the contemplated revisions to school facilities are substantial, it is appropriate that the District bring their Long Range Facilities Plan (LRFP) up to date. This effort clarifies how the planned renovations will address issues raised in the recent 2017 Facilities Review Report, and provides quantified analysis of those issues in preparation for necessary DOE Project Applications that will be needed shortly. With an updated LRFP submitted for state review, the normal applications for the various project components will proceed more effectively. This report explains the preliminary findings of the LRFP development that is currently proceeding.

Determination of Eligible Costs:

One of the chief objectives for the LRFP study is the calculation of "Unhoused Students". The DOE review process justifies the construction of **new classroom capacity based on the identified unhoused student total**. The district wants their planned additions to be declared as Eligible Cost to the greatest extent possible, in order to be eligible to obtain debt service aid. In past periods, the eligible designation had also applied to qualification to receive actual Grant Funding from the state. There is no current grant program currently in effect, so the categorization of eligibility is a determinant for the debt service aid only, at this time.

The need for **core facility space is based on program demand**, and is not directly reliant on the capacity generating classroom calculation. So the new Gyms at Union and Pierrepont, for example, are driven by aggregate needed physical education instruction time and other large group activity requirements that can be accommodated for the anticipated student population. Both the Union and Pierrepont schools currently have very small single station gymnasiums that do not adequately support the aggregate instructional time need.

Other improvements planned for the Referendum have to do with **upgrading building elements or building systems**. These are also not generally related to capacity calculation. They get listed in the LRFP "**System Action Report**". That part of the LRFP website lists the individual project names with their estimated project costs. The exactness of the estimate amount is less important than the fact that any given potential improvement is actually included in the list. Then, when a project application is submitted in the future, it can be labelled as being included in the district's LRFP, thus not requiring any LRFP amendment review. It smooths out the future application review for items like roof replacements, mechanical system changes, window replacements, and building repair items like the front exterior column deterioration at Union School, for example.

The System Action Section of the LRFP needs its own detailed review before submittal to make sure that we have included any potential renovation or upgrade action that the Administration expects to come up in the next five-year period. Listing any given line item as being in the LRFP does not commit the District to doing that project. It just allows for its possible selection of given building or site improvements based on future facility needs as they arise over time. We try to include various types of system alterations that have been found to be necessary in the past, just in case they become needed again. Inventory Actions are different, in that needs for new space (educational inventory) have to be based on either program needs or capacity deficiencies (measured as unhoused students).

Index to the Rutherford Long Range Facilities Plan (LRFP):

This Preliminary Report to the Board regarding the Rutherford LRFP is comprised of three sections.

1. **Report of Findings** that explains what has been discovered in regard to school capacities and the ability of the school buildings to support the District's educational programs. Where deficiencies have been documented, the report shows the project elements that will address the identified issues.
 - a. Executive Summary
 - b. **Observations on DOE LRFP website data** existing today.
 - c. **Report on School Capacities:** organized by school, showing how the planned projects respond to identified deficiencies.
2. **LRFP Official Reports** that have been generated from the official Department of Education (DOE) LRFP website, where PSA has been updating the Rutherford District information database over the past several weeks. The data is organized under the state's prescribed formats. "Existing Data" is carried forward from the most recent approved LRFP from 2009, which had been modified by various amendments through 2013. The "Proposed Data" has been now entered to reflect the planned basis for which we are seeking Department approval. Please note that the standard reporting format of the state website generated reports does not keep the order of the schools within the various reports in any consistent order. You must review the report sections carefully to make sure that any given data point in the report being reviewed is pertaining to the school you are intending to review.

Upon DOE review and approval of the LRFP submittal, the official database record gets corrected to reflect how your schools are being used today, and the planning data has valid content. This new more accurate summary of the District's facilities will then be the basis for comparison and evaluation of the planned projects seeking approval under the planned Referendum.

- a. Existing and Proposed Site Asset Inventory
 - b. Existing and Proposed School Asset Inventory
 - c. Existing Room Inventory (School Model) Report (Reported by School)
 - d. Proposed Room Inventory (School Model) Report (Reported by School)
 - e. Cohort-Survival Enrollment Projection Report
 - f. Existing and Projected Enrollment and School Grade Alignment
 - g. FES and District Practices Capacity Report
 - h. Functional Capacity and Unhoused Students (uses FES Area Allowance method)
 - i. Functional Capacity Excluded Square feet (calculates room areas that are above the FES)
 - j. Detailed System Action Report
 - k. District LRFP Action Summary Report
 - l. LRFP Submission Data Check Report
 - m. FES Room Type and Square Footage Analysis
3. **Overall School Plans** are attached to aid in understanding how buildings are used today, and how the planned changes will impact each school. The LRFP identifies deficiencies, and then presents the manner in which the District intends to address those deficiencies. DOE will approve the Rutherford Long Range Facilities Plan if they determine that your submitted approach sufficiently addresses the problems and satisfies the Department's Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES).

a. High School	RHS	Grades 9-12
b. Union Middle School	UMS	Grades 7-8
c. Pierrepont Elementary	PES	Grades 4-6
d. Lincoln Elementary	LES	Grades Pre-K, & 1-3 (for ½ of district)
e. Washington Elementary	WES	Grades Pre-K, & 1-3 (for ½ of district)
f. Kindergarten Center	KC	Kindergarten
g. The Bulldog Academy	BA (leased facility)	Adult Life Skills

Section 1 Report of Findings:

a.: Executive Summary

The updated Demographic Report from Whitehall Associates uses five years of historic enrollment data through the fall report in 2017 to forecast future enrollments for the next five year period using Cohort Survival calculations. Their demographic report shows the aggregate district student population increasing at a slow steady rate approaching one percent (01%) annually. The Rutherford total enrollment trend had previously been a profile that generally oscillated along at a maintenance rate, while periodic blips occurred that affected individual schools and grade levels. After an enrollment blip passed, student load had been returning approximately to historic norms. This new demographic indication in the latest report is now putting a slight upward incline in the overall enrollment trend. The impact of that change will be increased pressure on the facilities toward overcrowding. **The future planning will need to rebalance enrollment load and school capacity.** Because of how the grades are organized by building, the impacts of the aggregate upward pressure and localized spikes in enrollment numbers affect some schools more than others.

The **Rutherford High School** has routinely been operating beyond the FES calculated capacity for years. This has been accomplished with diligent tight scheduling of available rooms, using student counts per room slightly above FES values, and by resorting to other out of the box thinking to use available classroom and other space inventory more effectively. The DOE assumes overall utilization rate of 90% in elementary schools, and 85% in high schools. We suspect that your high school is running leaner than 85%, closer to the tighter target rate of an elementary school. The LRFP website reports unhoused total by straight FES calculation will be at **329** students within 5 years. The Department has not bothered Rutherford in the past regarding the habitual unhoused student figure at the high school, because it appears that performance is not being impaired. They have in past reviews effectively accepted your administrative practices being used as satisfying the intent of the Facilities Efficiency Standards. Still, the size of the deficit is worrying.

Planned projects at the **High School** will allow more intensive play field use and will correct the existing Cafeteria capacity shortage (both core facility upgrades, not capacity generating changes). However, the concept of relocating the Cafeteria does produce a good quantity of subsequently vacated interior space. The current idea is to create four (4) new Science Lab Rooms in that vacated area along with some new support space for the Science Faculty. This does mean that the end result of the HS Cafeteria change will yield added instructional space. That should effectively provide some relief to overcrowding at the High School because of the net add (4 rooms at 24 students each), regardless of what other room rearrangements ultimately get decided upon as classroom assignments get shifted to absorb the new instructional space inventory.

The District will still technically have significant unhoused student deficit beyond the FES calculated figure at the High School after the new projects, but DOE will see some capacity relief having been provided. The proposed changes will be an improvement, but will still rely upon continued use of district capacity management practices to address the over-full HS occupancy. Keep in mind that DOE will only approve the submitted LRFP if they conclude that the proposed actions will satisfactorily address the identified deficits.

Union School's use as a 7th and 8th Grade Middle School helped to reduce overcrowding at Union when compared to that building's previous 4-8 grade level assignment. In the next five years, the worst unhoused student projection compared to FES limit will be **58** students. When comparing to district determined room-use practices, the capacity deficit goes away. Raw student capacity is not the big issue at Union. The problem is deficiency of Physical Education space. Union has a significantly undersized Gym.

The proposed addition to **Union Middle School** would provide a **2-station Gym** with adequate supporting spaces to completely replace the existing small Gym. That existing room is completely surrounded by building and cannot be expanded where it is. The Gym Addition Project would yield enough vacated interior area at the old Gym to permit the construction of three new Science spaces. Fixing the Physical Education

problem and repurposing the old Gym space for STEM related programs will provide the opportunity to really enhance Union's standing as a true Middle School.

Pierrepont School now carries all district students in 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades. The existing condition shows an unhoused student total of 175 students when using FES student capacity values, and the planned addition reduces that deficit to 111 students. Only by using district practices does the unhoused count resolve to zero. DOE's additional space allocation for unhoused elementary students is 125 gross square feet (GSF) each, and for middle school (6th grade) it is 134 GSF each. The configuration of added classrooms also must support real student counts, when divided into grade levels and sections per grade that are being developed in the parallel schematic effort proceeding at this same time. The planned new core space revisions for Pierrepont School would provide sufficient Physical Education time and adequate large assembly capability, having programmatic justifications that are separate from the tests for justifying capacity generating classrooms.

There is one important planning note in regard to the classroom addition at **Pierrepont School**. The special education classroom provision could accommodate a program for autistic students currently being accommodated out of district via paid tuition to the specialty schools that were needed. If this program were returned to the District schools in space located at Pierrepont School, this change would significantly impact district operating costs in a positive way. That aspect of the long range planning needs important detailed review to finally determine the number of rooms that the program will need. Preliminary discussions indicated that the autistic student program could need up to three or four rooms, so the decision directly affects the size of a new classroom wing addition.

The other planning note on the new Classroom Wing at **Pierrepont School** has to do with the existing Modular Building. It presently contains three classrooms (two 4th Grade rooms and a Gifted and Talented room) not physically attached to the rest of the school. Since the new Gym addition will take away some outdoor play area, one concept being considered is to replace the 3 modular rooms within the new classroom wing, and remove the modular building. This change would accommodate a secure outdoor play area that is needed for the grade levels in this school and eliminate the existing situation where some students have to move outside in cold or inclement conditions between the separate modular building and the main school. However, the planned addition showing 10 added classrooms is needed for just unhoused students, and that room count is not enough to also absorb the replacement of the modular building. This problem is being studied schematically now, and would have to be resolved before submission to DOE.

Lincoln School has 18 unhoused students by FES calculation. This deficiency approximately supports one of the two new classrooms being planned at the location that was designed in when the original Lincoln addition was finished in 2005. **Washington School** shows 19 unhoused students on the same basis, representing the second new classroom planned at Lincoln. A slight revision of the line between sending areas within the Borough could accomplish the minor re-balancing shift toward Lincoln represented by the calculations. In reality, real room utilization decisions may vary from such a simplistic model, but for purposes of eligibility evaluation, this shift of load approach can be used. The Lincoln School 2-Room Addition can address the projected shortage for all Grade 1 through Grade 3 unhoused students. It does not address the six (6) unhoused Pre-K students flagged in the analysis of Lincoln School and Washington School enrollments provided later in this report.

The **Kindergarten Center** is scheduled to have a minor addition to gain accessibility, but that will not improve capacity. The elevator and lobby addition is for the purpose of creating handicapped access to program spaces on all three floors of the school. The alterations within the building will add accessible juvenile toilets to the three Kindergarten Rooms that presently do not have a dedicated toilet in the classroom. The Kindergarten Center has eight classrooms, and that is all that this building can ever have. The small site will simply not accommodate a classroom addition. This school where the eight K rooms are already at or over capacity, and with no solution given in the LRFP other than continuing to follow current district policy represents a point of potential exposure to DOE rejection of our Long Range Plan. So, this issue needs further discussion and review, at this point of internal preliminary report issuance. If our Long Range Facilities Plan submission contains a point of deficiency in capacity that the Department views as being important, we could be vulnerable to rejection on a point of nonconformance with FES.

The **Bulldog Academy** is the District's seventh school site, located in leased space on the lower level of the Rutherford Public Library. It is a new program this year, and currently does not have any capacity issues. It is designed to accommodate up to 15 students in the 18 to 21 year old group. It has no deficiencies other than being classified as temporary space, and has no planned project.

b.: Observations on DOE LRFP website data

According to Whitehall Associates, the District has the choice of submitting enrollment projection information by filling in the state template or by providing Table 5 from the Demographic Report that was produced by Whitehall Associates. They have verified the acceptability of their projections by the Facilities Planning Office of DOE. We find the Whitehall projections to be credible and consistent with your actual enrollment figures. However, due to past experiences with the expected DOE reviewer of your submission having stated that she will only accept the state template method, PSA suggests using the state template (with certain explanations attached regarding the known data problems) for a smoother review and approval process with the Department. We believe that the forecast distortions from the template use can be sufficiently explained.

Automated Cohort Survival ratio determinations from the DOE template for Pre-K enrollment trends are way too skewed by the very brief Pre-Kindergarten enrollment history for them, to calculate correct future enrollments accurately. Whitehall's report shows Pre-K numbers holding fairly steady, which is the probable condition. The state template badly errs in Cohort Survival calculation by hundreds of students, and is clearly not a valid projection. The template formatting is embedded in a protected excel spreadsheet, and the entry fields do not permit over-ride corrections by us. The valid Pre-K forecast will be provided in an explanatory footnote.

PSA has found that existing state DOE website data does not currently include the Kindergarten Center (formerly known as the Sylvan School) in the District Inventory. Instead, the record shows Lincoln Elementary School as having 179 Kindergarten Students. When the Kindergarten Center started operation, the reoccupied Sylvan School had been designated as an "Annex" to Lincoln Elementary School. This current LRFP update will restore the Kindergarten Center to its current status as one of the (6) six District-owned schools, under the Sylvan School's previous assigned numerical code (090). Currently, the KC building does not exist as a school on the website database in the District Inventory, but is listed instead as just a district owned "site."

The existing database has grade levels incorrectly assigned to buildings, since some reorganization has occurred since the last LRFP review. The new submitted LRFP will address the discovered missing and misaligned data in the website database so that the whole District profile is correct and current. Most importantly, the updated LRFP will contain all contemplated project components so that their submission in 2018 will match with already embedded potential project descriptions, making DOE review proceed more smoothly.

c. Report on School Capacities: (by school, in descending grade order)

In general, the District schools are currently running with very full class loads, completely allocated classroom inventories, some core facility deficiencies, and the existence of ongoing scheduling conflicts where competing program uses vie for the same limited inventory of spaces. The recent internal evaluation in early 2017 of the District's facilities identified needed corrective actions. The new LRFP establishes how well the existing school conditions meet the state's Facilities Efficiency Standards (FES), and then identifies the ways that the projects under consideration would address the disclosed deficiencies. This following summary reports the capacity for each school, and then briefly describes how planned projects would address the

problem. First, we provide explanation about how school capacity can be determined so that the numerical conclusions make sense.

Understanding Capacity: The DOE Facilities Efficiency Standard (FES) has established a maximum student count per classroom for each grade level and room use. Their finding is based on the Department's determination of adequate room size. When we design a new school building, the planned rooms must meet the room area prescription for each use. For example, the FES says that a **3rd Grade Classroom** should accommodate **21** students, and it must be **850** square feet in area. So, if you have an 850 square foot classroom, you can "house" **21** students. Now assume that you have set up **8** such rooms for the 3rd Grade students. Your 100% **theoretical capacity** at the example school would be **8** sections times **21** students each = **168** students. At the prescribed utilization rate of **90%** efficiency for elementary schools, your **target capacity** is the maximum count of **168** times **0.9** utilization factor = practical capacity of **152** students.

That would be the reported capacity on the official LRFP website, automatically calculated by the software. The website software will report both FES (prorated to room sizes), and the district practice values we can insert. For both data columns, the report is formatted to show numbers already reflecting the application of the utilization factor. Therefore, the **21** student count for the 3rd Grade dedicated classroom in our example above shows on the LRFP Room Inventory Report as only **18.9** students. Once the projected enrollments are entered into the database, the software automatically calculates the unhoused students. There is a small amount of distortion built in because the grand total shown has counted and combined fractional people.

In the example above, if you compare your demographic projection for 3rd Graders to that target capacity and find that it won't be exceeded in the next five years, then you would have no unhoused 3rd Graders. But, what if your enrollment forecast is larger than capacity? Then you would have "unhoused students", and DOE will expect submission of a Long Range Plan that solves the deficiency. In the case of unhoused students showing by the FES method, we either have to submit a solution, or show that district practice adequately addresses the deficiency.

The above example is easy in theory. But, what happens if your 3rd Grade rooms do not have the **850** square foot FES Size? In Rutherford, some of your rooms in the existing buildings are **700** square feet, or even less. In such cases, the LRFP website enters a **pro-rated capacity** for the reduced size rooms. Now, your **700** square foot room won't hold (in theory) **21** students. At the same area ratio per student, you can only place **17.29** students in that undersized room to be technically in compliance with FES. After the website applies the utilization factor, the prorated value further diminishes to **15.56** students in our example 700 sf room. In reality, the **Rutherford District Practice** is to use each of the various rooms that you have for a full section load, as you divide up your total enrollment load into the number of classroom sections that you have available. You treat each room as a fully capable classroom without adjusting for reduced room size when compared to the ideal FES standard.

The undersized rooms are common in the Rutherford buildings, so the automated FES capacity tabulation is routinely showing unhoused students. In that situation, the Department perceives a deficiency that the District manages sufficiently by adopting their administrative practices on room sizes and classroom permitted occupancy. For each school below, we provide both the FES reported capacity and the District determined capacity for comparison with the current enrollment and the maximum projected enrollment within the next five years.

The District determined room calculations are routinely presented "**without proration deduction at undersized classrooms**". This calculation basis respects the manner in which you actually operate your schools currently. To do otherwise would result in an overstatement of unhoused students. Using this District Practice basis is the most realistic for the District, but opens us to the possibility of DOE finding that we are simply not meeting the FES.

If we were to strictly follow the prorated room area limitations at undersized rooms, the resulting overstated capacity shortage would demand the building of more classrooms that can't be afforded, not to mention that new rooms would require more teachers that equally cannot be afforded. So, the only practical approach is

to count real capacity using your approved district practices to establish how many students can be accommodated. Remember, your submitted LRFP is expected to address all identified unhoused students.

Once the raw student capacity is known, then the building's core facilities should also be checked to see if they correspond to the total classroom generated count, and create a balanced school that will accommodate the full breadth of programs for the grade grouping being served.

Rutherford High School

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES:	437.80 Gr. 9-12 students (w/ proration and utilization)
Current Capacity per District Practices:	746.30 students w/out counting any use of Science Rooms as capacity generating homerooms
Current Enrollment:	731 students
Current Unhoused Students:	294 students, per FES; Zero by District Practice
Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project:	437.80
Proposed Capacity, District Practices:	831.30
Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years:	766
Unhoused Students after Project:	329 students, per FES; Zero by District Practice

The FES capacity shortage in Rutherford High School is being addressed by current District Capacity Practices on room areas and section size and use of specialized rooms as homerooms, yielding the capacity of **746.30** students. The current enrollment at Rutherford HS of **731** Gr. 9-12 students, is accommodated. Based on enrollment projections, the Rutherford HS population will decrease to **704** students and then gradually grow to **766** over the next five (5) years, so it will continue to require use of District practices to meet the increase. The 4 added Science Rooms used as homerooms boosts the maximum capacity to **831.30**.

The proposed HS projects within the referendum do not contain any classroom additions per se. However, the correction of the presently undersized Cafeteria issue would yield 4 new classrooms, so an improvement in instructional space inventory can be obtained. The concept is to use the four new rooms as Science Labs. The FES model does not show Science Labs as capacity generating spaces, unless the district opts to use them as capacity generators by being assigned homerooms. Regardless of the counting technics, four rooms being added to the HS classroom inventory will help with room scheduling, and open opportunities for creating an improved science department arrangement.

Final HS unhoused student calculation will depend on how many other room uses get impacted by the added science rooms. The new science rooms would be near to the existing STEM Lab and the TV Studio space. The opportunity may exist for creating a Science and Technology Center by revising other selected room assignments. This room utilization study needs further development in order to resolve the true unhoused student count improvement that would result from the educational inventory increase from the old Cafeteria. Bear in mind that a 4 room increase in any configuration of uses, will not reach full balance in capacity. We will still have unhoused students at the High School, in DOE's view. They could object to the long range plan not resolving the capacity deficiency fully to the FES requirement.

Union School

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES:	376.23 Gr. 7-8 students (w/ proration and utilization)
Current Capacity per District Practices:	516.60 students w/out counting any use of Science Rooms as capacity generating homerooms
Current Enrollment:	386 students

Current Unhoused Students: 10 students, per FES; **Zero** by District Practice

Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project: **376.23** Gr. 7-8 students

Proposed Capacity, District Practices: **516.60** Gr. 7-8 students

Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years: **434**

Unhoused Students after Project: **58** students, per FES; **Zero** by District Practice

By utilizing the FES, the capacity of Union School will be **deficient** by **58** students, without using the new Science and specialty rooms as home rooms. The current enrollment at Union is **386** Gr. 7-8 students. Based on enrollment projections, the Union student population will range from **377 – 434** students over the next five (5) years, staying within capacity only when compared to non-prorated capacity criteria. If Science rooms are used as homerooms, that would address the modest unhoused issue under the strictest comparison.

As observed earlier, raw student capacity is not the primary issue of concern at Union School. The important deficiencies at Union are in regard to Physical Education Space and the specialized classroom uses that must presently take place in the Library. The small existing Gym is basically a single station room, with less than half of the space requirement listed in the FES for a middle school Gym. So, it is a Core Facility upgrade that is very much needed here. The planned Gymnasium Addition will provide a full two-station Gym with support spaces to fully accommodate the Physical Education requirement.

That relocation of the Gym Instruction from the existing small Gym to the new properly sized facility will leave the existing Gym space available to accommodate three new Science / STEM rooms that the Middle School also needs. The concept plan shows a large STEM Lab, a Maker Space Lab currently running in the Library Media Center, and a Z-Space Visualization Lab also currently residing in the Library. Reallocating those presently superimposed uses at the Library Media Center will return the full Library space to its intended use.

Pierrepont School

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES: **452.41** Gr. 4-6 students (w/ proration and utilization)

Current Capacity per District Practices: **593.78** Gr. 4-6 students

Current Enrollment: **627** students

Current Unhoused Students: **175** students, per FES; **34** by District Practice

Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project: **560.78** Gr. 4-6 students

Proposed Capacity, District Practices: **710.78** Gr. 4-6 students

Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years: **671** students

Unhoused Students after Project: **111** students, per FES; **Zero** by District Practice

According to the FES, the capacity of Pierrepont School is **452.41** Gr. 4-6 grade students, with applying proration deduction at undersized classrooms. The current enrollment of Pierrepont is **627** Gr. 4-6 grade students. Based on enrollment projections, the Pierrepont student population will range from **563 – 671** students over the next five (5) years. Even without proration of undersized rooms to FES values, the forecast enrollment will surge past the building's 100% capacity. Although the theoretical maximum total seems close to the full allocation capacity, there are two factors that disclose the scope of the true deficiency.

First is that the existing school has relatively small classrooms, averaging typically below the FES specified room area of 800 square feet. Strict application of FES with capacities prorated for the undersized rooms yields eighty-seven (87) **4th and 5th grade students considered to be un-housed, and seventy-three (73) 6th**

grade students unhoused, for a Pierrepont total unhoused population of 160 students. The special education total is in addition to the graded subtotal.

The second factor is that this is the 100% use total which is actually not achievable. Student populations are organized by grade level, and by section groups within each grade. Shortages in one category cannot be filled by excesses in another grade. These “float factors” within each grade level fluctuate from year to year with varying efficiency that cannot be corrected. This is why the utilization factor must also be considered.

The **gross square allowance** capacity eligibility check is as follows.

4 th and 5 th grade:	87 x 125 gsf per student =	10,875 gsf of addition
6 th grade:	73 x 134 gsf per student =	9,782 gsf of addition
Total not including special educ.	160 students total	20,657 gsf of new classrm. wing

New classrooms are definitely needed at Pierrepont School. Existing large class sizes back this up. New space is justified on a gross square foot basis at the FES Gross SF per unhoused student factor. District Planning has also identified that Special Needs Students who are currently being accommodated outside of the District can be brought back into the District if space is available. The final confirmed configuration of needed classroom sections per grade and special education rooms checked against the eligible GSF limit will determine final eligibility for the classroom addition part of the addition. Preliminary comparison shows the proposed plan to be approximately at the correct size, only if the modular classroom building remains in service.

Like Union, Pierrepont School also has a small single station Gym, grossly inadequate for the large student count at this school. The concept is to provide a new 2 Station Gym, with stage. That will correct the Physical Education deficiency and simultaneously address the inadequate existing Multi-Purpose Room (MPR) that cannot seat even a single grade level for assembly at one time, let alone for the whole student body. The existing MPR would then be renovated to serve as the Cafeteria. The provision of the new correctly sized Gym would vacate the existing small Gym and support spaces. Demolishing that Old Gym building element would provide available space to permit the needed new classroom wing.

The District will also need to decide about keeping or removing the existing 3-room Modular Building. The new classroom addition could be sized to also replace these three rooms presently existing in their own separate building. Removal of the modular building would permit the creation of a new fenced outdoor play area to replace part of the exterior play space lost due to the new Gym Addition. Early schematic development for the Pierrepont plan will need to show the planning options to be discussed.

Lincoln School

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES:	279.29 Gr. 1-3 students and 30 Pre-K students, total 309
Current Capacity per District Practices:	322.90 Gr. 1-3 students and 30 Pre-K students, total 352.90
Current Enrollment:	324 students
Current Unhoused Students:	44.71 students, per FES; 4 Pre-K by District Practice
Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project:	317.09 Gr. 1-3 students and 30 Pre-K students, total 347.09
Proposed Capacity, District Practices:	360.70 Gr. 1-3 students and 32 Pre-K students, total 392.70
Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years:	343
Unhoused Students after Project:	18 Gr. 1-3 students, per FES; 4 Pre-K by District Practice

The current Pre-K enrollment at Lincoln is 34 students, with four (4) considered un-housed by the DOE. Based on enrollment projections, the Pre-K enrollment will hold steady with 31-33 students over the next five years. Based on projections, the Gr. 1-3 enrollment will increase steadily to 312 students within the next five (5) years, resulting in 18 unhoused students.

The 2005 Lincoln School addition had been previously designed to accommodate the future construction of two full size classrooms on the second level of that 2005 addition. Based on the new enrollment analysis, it is being proposed that the addition of these two rooms be included in the planned projects to resolve the unhoused total of Lincoln and Washington schools combined.

Lincoln School will also be receiving addition to their outdoor play equipment with an age-appropriate area for the Pre-K students.

Washington School

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES:	270.49 Gr. 1-3 students and 30 Pre-K students, total 300.49
Current Capacity per District Practices:	347.80 students w/out counting any use of Science Rooms as capacity generating homerooms
Current Enrollment:	334 students
Current Unhoused Students:	294 students, per FES; 2 Pre-K by District Practice
Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project:	270.49 Gr. 1-3 students
Proposed Capacity, District Practices:	347.80 Gr. 1-3 students
Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years:	376
Unhoused Students after Project:	19 Gr. 1-3 students, per FES; 2 Pre-K by District Practice

The District currently has a Pre-K enrollment at Washington of 32 students with two (2) considered unhoused by the DOE. Based on the new enrollment projections, Pre-K enrollment will hold steady within 31-33 students over the next five (5) years. Based on enrollment projections, the Gr. 1-3 enrollment will increase steadily to 313 students within the next five (5) years, resulting in 19 unhoused students.

No addition is being contemplated at Washington School because a minor redrawing of the district dividing line (between Washington and Lincoln sending areas) would shift the excess to Lincoln School, where they would be accommodated by the second new classroom described above.

Washington School will be also be receiving an addition to their outdoor play equipment with an age-appropriate area for the Pre-K students.

Kindergarten Center

Summary of Capacity Definitions:

Current Capacity per FES:	123.17 Gr. K students (w/ proration and utilization)
Current Capacity per District Practices:	172.80 Gr. K students
Current Enrollment:	179 students
Current Unhoused Students:	56 students, per FES; 7 by District Practice
Proposed Cap. FES, after planned project:	123.17 Gr. K students
Proposed Capacity, District Practices:	172.80 Gr. K students
Projected Max. Enrollment for 5 years:	186
Unhoused Students after Project:	63 students, per FES; 14 by District Practice

When utilizing the FES student count limit, the capacity of the Kindergarten Center is only 123.17 students for the eight rooms, which does factor in prorated reduction for the undersized rooms. Based on the District Capacity practices, the capacity of the Kindergarten Center has to factor up to 24 students per room for a total enrollment capacity of 192 students (enough to result in zero unhoused). The DOE web-based report will only show the district determined values above, still leaving 14 unhoused.

Several rooms in the Kindergarten Center do not currently have toilets within the Kindergarten Classroom, as required by DOE standards. This proposed project will add those three juvenile toilets. Note that in one room, the toilet addition will make the existing undersized room still smaller than it is today.

The Kindergarten Center will also be receiving an addition to their outdoor play equipment for the Kindergarten students to have sufficient play area. The building is operating at near its capacity, and expansion of the exterior playground space is needed to accommodate the student total.

The Bulldog Academy

This leased space was just added this year as the District's seventh school facility. Its assigned three digit code is X01. Leased spaces are all assigned X numbers. Renovations were already completed, so no planned action is being listed for the Academy. It is an ungraded facility, with a listed capacity of 15 students.